DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 257 SO 016 033

AUTHOR Shaver, James P.
TITLE Reflections of Citizenship Education and Traditional Social Studies Programs.
PUB DATE Nov 84
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (64th, Washington, DC, November 15-19, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; Critical Thinking; *Curriculum Development; Educational History; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Skill Development; *Social Studies; Supplementary Reading Materials; Teaching Methods; Textbooks

ABSTRACT

For the overarching goals of citizenship education to be met, certain reforms and revisions of the standard social studies curriculum must be made. However, it is possible to do a great deal to meet these goals from within the confines of the traditional social studies textbook and social studies course. In the past, several projects have attempted to do this. The Harvard Project of the 1950's and 1960's was designed on the premise that curriculum development had to take place in the school setting and with the involvement of practicing teachers if the results were to be responsive to school needs. The Utah State University Program, undertaken in the 1960's, culminated in the development of the Analysis of Public Issues Program, a set of supplementary materials for integrating critical thinking skills and analytic concepts into the social studies course. The challenge facing social studies educators today should not be whether to abandon totally the traditional curriculum but how to encourage more of an emphasis on citizenship education within the realistic demands of public school teaching. (LP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

REFLECTIONS ON CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND TRADITIONAL SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAMS*

James P. Shaver
Utah State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James P. Shaver
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED250257

This brief paper, which was written to serve as the basis for my comments at a session organized by Jean Craven, President of the National Council for the Social Studies in 1984, started out as an effort to delineate where I currently stand in regard to the prospects for citizenship education within the outlines of the present social studies curriculum. Interestingly to me, it turned out to be somewhat of a recounting of a personal-professional and philosophical odyssey--a little bit of a personal history.

When Jean Craven discussed with me the idea of a past-presidents' round table on citizenship education, she said she wanted to get the speakers to deal with issues that might be difficult to handle from their own professional perspectives. She wanted to "hold the speakers' heels to the fire", to get them to readdress their own frames of reference vis-a-vis citizenship education.

Jean commented that I was perceived by many social studies educators as believing that adequate citizenship education would require major revision of the current social studies curriculum. Yet, she noted, we would probably both agree that a complete overhaul of the curriculum is not a realistic expectation. So, the question she posed was, how does my position that citizenship education should be the overarching goal of social studies education translate into the K-12 social studies curriculum as it is, and is likely to be? Or, put differently, can that overarching goal be addressed adequately within the current curricular framework, or is extensive revision and restructuring needed?

SP 016 033

*Invited paper presented at a Past-presidents' Round Table on Citizenship Education at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D. C., November 18, 1984.

Teachers and Curricular Change

It is ironic, if one looks at my own curricular roots, that I have come to be labeled as a curricular revolutionary--that is, that I am perceived as arguing that most or all of the current social studies curriculum must be thrown out in the interest of sufficient citizenship education. Recall that I began my career in social studies as a doctoral student with Donald W. Oliver in the late 1950's. Don had one of the early Cooperative Education Research Projects from the U. S. Office of Education--a project which has come to be known as the Concord Project or, more often, as the Harvard Project.[1]

Interestingly, at a time that many curriculum developers were talking of "teacher proof" materials--that is, materials developed by university personnel in such ways that teachers in the field could not "screw them up" in use--our project was designed on the premise that if curriculum development was to be meaningful and the results usable, development had to take place in school settings and practicing teachers had to be involved so that the results would be responsive to school needs and practical schooling knowledge. Leonard Godfrey, a teacher at the Peter Bulkeley Junior High School in which we worked, was a major participant in the Concord Project, sharing in curriculum and research decisions. And, all of us taught at least half-time in the school as "teacher-researchers". In addition, although the project was focused on the analysis of public controversy[2], we taught and

---

[1]The Harvard Project actually continued beyond our R&D effort in Concord, so I will refer to the Concord Project to indicate that part of the Harvard Project that led to the publication of Teaching Public Issues in the High School (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966; reprinted by the Utah State University Press, 1974), which I co-authored with Don Oliver.

[2]The final report was entitled, The Analysis of Public Controversy: A Study in Citizenship Education (Oliver and Shaver, Report to the U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 551, 1963, ED 003 364; ED 003 365).

developed our curriculum in the context of the two-year U. S. history sequence which was the conventional curriculum at Peter Bulkeley.

One of the probing questions which Jean Craven asked of me was, what might a standard geography course look like if taught from a citizenship education orientation? Suggestions about the answer to that question can be found in Chapter 8 of Teaching Public Issues in the High School[3], "Selecting and Organizing Problem Units" and in the appendix, "An Experimental Curriculum Project Carried Out Within the Jurisprudential Framework", in a section on "The Curriculum" (pp. 247-56). That curriculum is summarized in two tables attached to this paper.

An inspection of those tables will indicate that our seventh and eighth grade courses looked very much like the standard curriculum, except for the pre- and posttesting for the research project and units on "critical thinking skills" and applying a "model for handling political controversy". The only other surprises might be a unit specifically addressing "the structure and principles of American government" and a unit on "school desegregation".[4] Perhaps, too, some might be surprised by topical units such as "The American Indian", "The Problem of Fair Competition and Monopoly", and "American Immigration Policy". However, these topical units clearly fell within the domain, and the chronological sequence, of the U. S. history course--for which, incidentally, the textbook was Wildler, Ludlum, and Brown, This Is America's Story (Houghton Mifflin).

The units reflect an approach called "postholing"[5], in which students go into some subjects in-depth (digging the postholes), with the textbook used

---

[3]This is an anomalous title, given that our initial work was at the junior high school level and that the rationale spelled out in the book speaks to K-12 curricular decisions. That we selected such an overly restrictive label for our work has baffled me and, I think, confused others.

[4]Remember, this was the late 1950's when racial segregation was still emerging as a major public issue in our society.

[5]A term made popular, as I recall, by historian Charles Keller.

to provide chronological connections (stringing the wires between the postholes). Our topical units dealt either with specific problem areas, such as school desegration or immigration policy, or with historical crisis periods, such as the New Deal. Of course, materials other than the textbook were used to involve students in the problems underlying the topics and to provide them with information necessary to the fruitful consideration of the issues.

This approach--that is, imbedding the analysis of public issues in specifically designed units to be taught within a traditional course--was operationalized in the Public Issues Series/Harvard Social Studies Project AEP Unit Books which were edited by Don Oliver and Fred Newmann.[6] Some of the AEP Unit Books, such as The New Deal, were direct offsprings of the Concord Project units. Indeed, the question has been raised as to whether some of the project's teacher-researchers got adequate credit for their efforts in developing and authoring the materials.

It is not just coincidental, I believe, that the AEP Unit Books were among the most widely used of the New Social Studies projects' materials, even if the percentage of classroom teachers who used them was not strikingly high. Teachers liked the unit books because they could insert them in the standard textbook curriculum. Use of the units did not require abandonment of the textbook, but provided an opportunity for teachers to teach units that were interesting to students and that, in addition, dealt with citizenship education goals to which many of the teachers were genuinely committed.

In fact, before the AEP series was available, I often advised prospective teachers in my social studies methods course who asked how they

---

[6]Fred came into the doctoral program at Harvard, as I recall, about the time I got my doctorate and a year before I moved on to Utah State University.

could teach for citizenship education objectives within the textbook structure, that they adopt a mini-AEP approach. That is, I suggested that during their first year of teaching, they develop one unit that fit a citizenship orientation and which they enjoyed teaching. The next year, they could develop one more unit and revise the first year's unit, continuing the same process in future years. In five years, they would have five units that were citizenship-oriented and enjoyable to teach. The units would be a significant component of their course, making the experiences there noticeably different for students and more likely to make a contribution to citizenship goals. Better yet if they could get other teachers to develop units, either working cooperatively on the same ones or sharing those which were different. It would be close to the best of all worlds to have a district social studies specialist who would provide some coordination of unit development and sharing, even to the point of encouraging agreement as to which citizenship objectives would be targeted within specific courses and what special units would be developed for each.

From "Inside Development" to "Throw the Rascals Out"

From that auspicious start with a position which clearly advocated working from within the standard, textbook-based curriculum, how did I come to be identified as a "throw the rascals out" revolutionary? I suspect that the following train of events provides at least a partial explanation.

As I worked as a consultant and gave speeches to different groups and talked to people afterwards, teachers often said that the "analytic concepts" chapter of Teaching Public Issues in the High School and the AEP booklet, Taking a Stand (which presented analytic-discussion concepts from the Concord Project), were too general to be useful in teaching--that is, the concepts were not specified adequately and there was not sufficient material provided

for teaching then. I agreed with this criticism and submitted a proposal to the U. S. Office of Education[7] for what became the USU Project--one of the last of the USOE Cooperative Education Projects and, in that sense, one of the last of the New Social Studies projects.

Again, we worked in the schools with teachers--initially, the social studies team[8] in the Roy High School near Ogden, Utah. I included funds in the proposal to hire the team to work Saturdays and summers on the project's development efforts. Then, as part of the development effort, Guy Larkins and I taught at the high school for a year as part of the team; that was followed by a year of teaching at Sky View High School (Smithfield, Utah) in a regular classroom, while other teachers in that school also tried out the materials. The result was a curriculum development-research report[9] and the Analysis of Public Issues Program.[10]

The Analysis of Public Issues Program (API) addressed the earlier criticisms about lack of specification of the analytic concepts and lack of materials to teach them. It was in a fundamental sense, an expansion of the eight-week "critical thinking skills" and three-week "application of analytic

---

[7]"A Secondary School Social Studies Curriculum Focused on Thinking About Public Issues", February 21, 1966.

[8]Bruce Griffin, now Associate Superintendent, Office of Curriculum and Instruction, Utah State Office of Education, was the team leader.

[9]James P. Shaver & A. Guy Larkins, "The Analysis of Public Issues: Concepts, Materials, Research". Report to the U. S. Office of Education, Project No. 6-2288, Logan, UT: Utah State University, Bureau of Educational Research, 1969 (ED 037 475).

[10]The Program, which was published by Houghton Mifflin, included an audio-visual kit, a set of duplicating masters, a student text, Decision-making in a Democracy (Shaver & Larkins, 1973), an Instructor's Manual (Shaver & Larkins, 1973), and five problem booklets with instructor's guides--Progress and the Environment: Water and Air Pollution (Shaver, Larkins, & Donald E. Anctil, 1973), The Police and Black America (Larkins & Shaver, 1973), Race Riots in the Sixties (Larkins & Shaver, 1973), Women: The Majority-Minority (June R. Chapin & Margaret S. Branson, 1973), and Student's Rights: Issues and Constitutional Freedoms (Richard S. Knight, 1974).

model" units from the Harvard Project. The problem was, where would the program fit in the schools?

In proposing the USU Project, I envisioned developing materials for a course in which a semester would be spent teaching students the analytic concepts, with the potential for a year-long course, with the students involved the second semester in applying the concepts to the analysis of specific public issues, such as what, if anything, to do about sexual discrimination. It was anticipated that teachers of civics courses or problems of democracy courses would use the materials in either the semester or the year-long format, and that units (we called them "bundles") would be selected for use in other courses.

Our plans for semester or year-long use, we found, clashed directly with the traditional textbook-based nature of even problems of democracy courses. Unfortunately, the API Program was made up of a lot of material. Although we had organized the program in small "bundles" that could be selected and taught individually or in concept clusters, they apparently were not perceived that way--which is not surprising, given that they were bound in one volume and not really "advertized" as separable components. Moreover, it was more difficult for teachers to "get into" the Instructor's Manual than we anticipated. Add to all of this that the materials were, in my judgment, not marketed well by Houghton Mifflin; they apparently got little attention at the field representative level, and sales materials that were to assist in acquainting social studies people with the program were never developed. This problem was exacerbated by the fact that the bundles dealt with analytic concepts that were not traditionally part of social studies courses, as contrasted with the topics of the AEP Unit Books (with the exception of the brief Taking A Stand).

Despite all the above, one simply cannot overlook the basically poor anticipation on my part of the extent to which the institutionally imbedded,

traditional textbook-based curriculum would foil nontraditional curriculum development efforts--a naivete, so it turned out, that we shared with other New Social Studies projects. It was frustrating that while university colleagues and public school people at local, state, and national social studies meetings lauded the program, it was little used in the public schools--although, in retrospect, that result is perfectly understandable.

My frustration was further fueled by analyses of textbooks by myself[11] and many others, indicating basic superficiality and failure to address citizenship education goals, and by the continuing findings on students' apathy toward social studies and the lack of effects of social studies courses on citizenship participation. I became a rather virulant, outspoken critic of textbooks, insulting, I suspect, more than one publisher with strong comments on the negative role that textbooks played in social studies instruction and on what I perceived to be the unconscionable failure of publishers to attempt to break a cycle in which they said they were only responding to the demands of teachers, but in which the teachers said they were trapped in their teaching by what the textbooks provided them.

During this period, I also became more concerned about the assumptions from which we teach. In particular, I became more reflective about the presumptions that underlay the "jurisprudential approach", laid out in Teaching Public Issues in the High School, which had come to be taken by many as synonymous with socratic teaching, but which was actually a rationale for approaching social studies curricular decisions. Indeed, in my consulting work and in the speeches I gave, I frequently tried to involve teachers and curriculum specialists in identifying the assumptions which we commonly make

---

[11]James P. Shaver, "Reflective Thinking, Values, and Social Studies Textbooks", School Review, 1965, 73, 226-57; "Diversity, Violence, and Religion: Textbooks in a Democratic Society". School Review, 1967, 75, 311-28.

about both the nature of the society and how people learn and in examining the inconsistencies between those assumptions and the textbook-oriented curriculum.

Then, in 1976, I became President of the National Council for the Social Studies. The Annual Meeting Program Committee for that year settled on the general theme, "200 Years--Now What?". Based on a recognition of "the role of tension in our past, present, and future", the committee devised the idea of using as the centerpiece for the annual meeting general sessions focused on "the confrontation of tension--within the political system, within the economic order, within the social order . . . , and last, but certainly not least, within the profession". The point was "to encourage introspection, self-criticism, and reflection among those concerned with social studies education".[12] How could a theme have been a better fit with my own inclinations--the social conflict orientation of the jurisprudential approach, which was an integral part of my own thinking, and my stance on the disfunctions of the curriculum, as embodied in textbooks, in regard to citizenship education.

The Program Committee had to decide who should address the topic of "Tensions Within the Profession". Should it be an NCSS outsider, as with the general sessions on tensions within the political, economic, and social systems (i.e., Harlan Cleveland, Dixie Lee Ray, Martin Agronsky, and John Richardson)? Would an outsider be sufficiently informed about the organization? Might an outsider be too inclined to simply attack social studies without sharing in the values of NCSS members? On the other hand, could an "insider" be adequately self-critical and challenging? As I recall,

---

[12]These quotes are taken from my letter, as NCSS President, to "NCSS members or friends", published in the annual meeting program, inviting them to attend the 1976 annual meeting.

Ron Savage or Jack Henes[13] especially pushed the latter question, obviously dubious that an insider would do anything but a self-serving (for himself and the organization) job. I "rose to the occasion" and offered to select "tensions within the professions" as the topic for my Presidential Address, assuring folks that I would not disappoint expectations in regard to a searching self-examination of the profession.

The result was an address, "A Critical View of the Social Studies Profession" which I intended as an honest, heartfelt, and sincere appraisal of what I perceived to be the basic problem of the social studies "profession",[14] that is, the lack of thoughtfulness about purpose and about how content and organization affected purpose in social studies education. Even Ron Savage (or Jack Henes) indicated after the session that he did not think I had done an "insider's copout". Howard Mehlinger, who introduced me and shared the podium, felt it necessary in closing the session to make some brief remarks in regard to good things going on in social studies. Agreeing with him and realizing that perhaps a wrong tone had been set, I added an addendum to that effect to the version of the speech published in Social Education.[15]

In retrospect, it was probably unfortunate that, to draw attention to the seriousness of the problem of thoughtlessness, I used Silberman's[16] term "mindlessness" to refer to the "thoughtlessness" phenomenon. I did not recognize adequately the potential effects of the negative loading of the term "mindlessness" and the near impossibility of avoiding that loading, even

---

[13]One or the other pushed this point. Jack cannot remember doing so (although I am quite certain it was he) and I have not had a chance to check with Ron.

[14]I used the notion of a profession, which was a current topic of interest, as an introductory and organizational idea.

[15]1977, 41, 300-307.

[16]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1770.

through careful definition and assurances that it applied to other fields--e.g., journalism--as well as social studies. That was an ironic misestimate, in light of our own curricular injunctions to students about the effects of negatively loaded language.[17]

I suspect that my presidential address served to crystallize a view of me by some as one who believed that complete overhaul of the current social studies curriculum was needed if the overarching citizenship education goal was to be met adequately. Indeed, that was probably a pretty fair reflection of my views at the time.

The Prodigal Returns

Following my term of office as President of NCSS, the National Science Foundation sponsored a set of studies on the status of pre-collegiate mathematics, science, and social science education in this country. Given the ambiguity in regard to a social science-social studies distinction in the public schools, it was more the status of social studies education than of social science education that was examined.

NSF wanted several professional organizations to prepare interpretative reports of the studies of status findings, and I helped Brian Larkin, then executive director of NCSS, to prepare a proposal to NSF for an NCSS interpretative report. The proposal was funded and I chaired the work group made up of myself, O. L. Davis, Jr., and Suzanne Helburn.

Those of you who have read our interpretative report[18] will know that it is very sympathetic to classroom teachers, acknowledging the constraints and

---

[17] See, e.g., Shaver and Larkins, Decision-making in a Democracy, Sections 3, 4, and 5.

[18] James P. Shaver, O. L. Davis, Jr., & Suzanne M. Helburn, "An Interpretative Report on the Status of Pre-College Social Studies Education Based on Three NSF Studies". In What are the Needs in Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education? Views from the Field. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, 1980; plus an executive summary, "The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions From Three NSF Studies", Social Education, 1979, 43, 150-53.

constrictions under which they function. Doing the report reminded me once again of the realities of classroom teaching, including the problems of classroom management and the fact that teachers function in a social system with its own values and expectations.[19] O. L., Susie, and I were also struck by the discrepancies between university professors' rather idealistic approach to social studies and the view of social studies curriculum and instruction from the perspective of teachers who confront their class-upon-class each day within the social system of the school.

I came away from preparing that report with not only a renewal of my "Concord Project--USU Project commitment" to cooperative university curriculum developer-public school teacher relations, but with an appreciation that was not even present in the Concord Project for the constraints within which social studies teachers conduct their professional lives. I continued to be concerned about the lack of citizenship effects of the social studies curriculum and the failure of this potentially exciting area to evoke student interest (and I continue to be so concerned today[20]). There was no moderation in my commitment to the belief that greater thoughtfulness about our goals and about how our content, teaching materials, and classroom-school organization affect the goals continues to be a major need, not only in social studies but in other curricular areas and throughout the school.[21] But that belief does not conflict with my continuing belief, a

---

[19]The Case Studies in Science Education by Robert Stake and Jack Easley (see either of the reports by myself, O. L. Davis, and Susie Helburn for a full reference) especially influenced our report.

[20]As indicated in my chapter, "What are the Implications from Research for What Should be Taught in Social Studies?" In Virginia Koehler (Ed.), The Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective. New York: Longman, in press.

[21]See, for example, my book with William Strong, Facing Value Decisions: Rationale-building for Teachers (2nd Ed.), New York: Teachers College Press, 1982 and a paper, "Models for Ethics Education From Recent Innovations: A Social Studies View" presented to a Conference on Educating for Ethical Conduct in Virginia: The Role of the Public Schools, Blacksburg, Virginia, November 12-14, 1981.

la the Concord-USU Projects approach, that much citizenship education can be done within the context and confines of the traditional social studies courses, through teaching units that address public issues, analysis concepts, participation skills, and the engagement of students in thinking about public issues. The cumulative effect of such relatively small efforts could be great, but such an effect will require much greater introspection by both teachers and teacher educators.[22]

Small increments, as in the use of specially designed units and in changed orientations toward students--e.g., in how one handles daily dialogues about classroom decisions[23]--could have a collective major impact within a textbook structure that may well be necessary as long as the demands on teachers are so heavy that more creative instructional preparations and flexible teaching arrangements are often extremely difficult, if not impossible. Clearly, a first requirement for a drastically different citizenship education curriculum such as many of us wished for in the late 60's and 70's, and many hope for now, is a teaching situation in which teachers do not face so many students and preparations each day. That is not economically likely on any large scale.

Would the "Ideal" Curriculum be Desirable?

Clearly, then, I believe that much more could be done to achieve our overarching goal of citizenship education within the standard course structure, with very little disturbance to the outcomes that teachers are

---

[22]As I emphasized in my paper, "The NSF Studies of Status of Pre-Collegiate Education: Implications for Social Studies Professors and Curriculum Developers", presented to a College and University Faculty Assembly Symposium, The NSF and RAND Reports: Implications for the Social Studies, at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Portland, Oregon, November 20, 1979.

[23]See, for example, Shaver & Strong, Facing Value Decisions: Rationale-building for Teachers.

conventionally expected to attain. What, however, if there were the opportunity to throw out textbooks and the current curriculum and build an ideal social studies scope and sequence? Would I want to abandon totally the current textbook-oriented structure?

To begin with, I must note that despite the misinterpretation by some that I am hostile toward the teaching of history and the social sciences, I suspect because of the emphasis which I have placed on the analysis of public issues and my concern about secondary school teachers who are too "wrapped up" in their content area, I have consistently believed that content is a vital part of the social studies-citizenship education curriculum. Students do need to study history and they do need social science knowledge and concepts. The quandary is not in regard to whether we need content, but in regard to how we can teach it meaningfully so that it will be seen as relevant and useful and be used when it could be.

It is important, too, to recognize that there is a real lack of research evidence to use in deciding whether to abandon the present curriculum. Philip Jackson and Sarah Kieslar, in their discussion of fundamental research in education,[24] noted that, traditionally, the focus of educational researchers has been on attempting to gather evidence to be used in changing, i.e., improving, practice. That focus has resulted in a narrow perspective from which "we seldom ask whether educators might now be doing as well as can be done in many aspects of their endeavor". Jackson and Kieslar propose that "we might pay more attention to the possibility that educators may deserve and benefit greatly from external confirmation of the appropriateness of much of what they are doing". In fact, we know a fair amount about the negative effects or at least the lack of effects of social studies education, but we know very little, if anything, about its possible positive effects.

---

[24]Philip Jackson and Sarah B. Kieslar, "Fundamental Research and Education". Educational Researcher, 1977 (Sept.), 6(8), 13-18.

Addressing such questions is not even a part of our schemata for generating research problems. Could it be, for example, that as teachers intuitively recognize,[25] the traditional curriculum does serve important, but unassessed, ends.

I am reminded, for example, of Harold Berlak's[26] reminder that there is a fundamental dilemma of continuity and change that faces public education, and social studies in particular. That is, citizenship education is to contribute to change by helping students to learn to be analytic, to become self-conscious about and competent in questioning the adequacy of present societal solutions to issues, while at the same time helping to ensure the continuity of the society. Teachers do believe that doing schoolwork which seems onerous helps to prepare students for adult life, where many roles call for conforming behavior and doing unpleasant things. Even in considering what a democratic school should be like, it is important to remember that democratic society itself is not perfect. Not only should we not expect schools to be perfect, but it might well be disfunctional for citizenship education if schools were models of utopian democracies.[27]

Does the social studies curriculum as it exists perform an important stabilizing function for the society? Such a question recalls the warning of political scientist Robert Dahl[28] that it might be disastrous if all citizens

---

[25]See the Shaver, Davis, & Helburn interpretative report. Also, Jane J. White, "Ethnographic Research: Paradoxes and Problems for Social Studies Educators". In William B. Stanley (Ed.), Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1976-84. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, in press.

[26]Harold Berlak, "Human Consciousness, Social Criticism, and Civic Education". In James P. Shaver (Ed.) Building Rationales for Citizenship Education. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

[27]A point I mentioned in, James P. Shaver, "Democracy, Courts, and the Schools". Theory Into Practice, 1978, 17, 279-90.

[28]Robert A. Dahl, Who Governs? New Haven: Neil University Press, 1961.

tried to participate in governmental affairs, as ideal definitions of ideal democracy say they should.

There can be no doubt about the soundness of the radical critique[29] which argues that much of what is done in schools is a nefarious perpetuation of inequitable and unjustifiable social and economic structures. That is, the accusation that the school, in part at least, serves to maintain the power of the "haves" as against the "have nots" has validity. Anyon's[30] study of the differences in social studies curricula depending upon the social status of the parents served by the particular schools is a compelling reminder of this negative aspect of schooling for stability.

It should be noted that the Harvard and USU Projects' use of socratic discussions to analyze the society's and students' positions on public issues was really a form of social criticism. That is, the overriding questions in those discussions was whether the society, as well as individuals, had unjustifiably and unwittingly neglected some basic values of our society in promoting others. For example, one question we posed for students in Concord in the late 1950s was whether a society with racial desegretation can legitimately claim meaningful commitment to human dignity and to the basic values of the society, such as equality of opportunity, which give meaning to human dignity.

There is little question, as Shirley Engle argues so eloquently, that more attention to social criticism is needed in social studies education. But we know little about how far such instruction can go and how early it can take place without resulting in serious societal disruptions. On this point,

---

[29]See, e.g., William B. Stanley, "Research in the Foundations of Social Education". In William B. Stanley (Ed.), Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1976-84. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, in press.

[30]Jean Anyon, "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work". Journal of Education, 1980(Winter), 1, 67-92.

I may sound surprisingly conservative. But I do suspect that many times in our prophetic intellectual zeal, we are too rationalistic. As Perrow[31] has noted, in that sense at least, we have lost touch with the humanistic and fatalistic proclivities of the ancient Greeks, from whom much of our sense of a democratic spirit evolved.

Are we, for example, too convinced that all of the effects of the unintentional, or hidden, curriculum are bad? I believe, with Diane Ravitch[32], that our value system can stand analysis and criticism, that "the ideals and principles of a free society . . . may be taught by debate, by challenge, and by a critical 'problems of democracy' approach . . . because of our belief that these values are so compelling that they can survive critical analysis and prevail in the free marketplace of ideas". But, how far can social criticism go in schools without harmful effects? In casting out the traditional curriculum, we ought not, to use a homely metaphor, throw the baby out with the bath. It is important to keep in mind that solutions that seem manifestly compelling may turn out to be deleterious. At one time, for example, it seemed obvious that it would be helpful to give oxygen to premature babies who were having trouble breathing, and it was done rather routinely. Years later, so my colleagues in the Institute for Early Intervention Research at Utah State University tell me, it was discovered that one outcome was increased blindness among those babies.

In short, we speculate about drastic revisions in the social studies curriculum, based on some research evidence as to its lack of effect or negative effects, but with little evidence as to its possible countervailing positive effects. Moreover, proposals for change are based on speculation

---

[31]Charles Perrow, "Disintegrating Social Sciences", New York University Education Quarterly, 1981(Winter), 12, 2-9.

[32]Diane Ravitch, "Educational Policies that Frustrate Character Development". Character, 1980, 1(7), 1-4.

about impacts. Even if we could totally revise the scope and sequence of social studies programs in this country to correspond to an ideal of citizenship education, great care would be needed to preserve that which now contributes positively to the society, while only inserting that which is better. The ideals of a democratic society and the workings of human nature do not always coincide.

Conclusion

So, at this point in a personal-professional odyssey, I come to the answer that surely much, and much more, can be done in the interests of citizenship education within the confines of the textbook-oriented curriculum. What can be done may perhaps not be all that some of us have argued for, and continue to argue for; but the outcomes of the limitations may not be entirely bad. Challenges do remain: How can we encourage even more in social studies of what is needed for citizenship education, within the realistic demands of teaching in our public schools? And, can we identify what is good about social studies education in that context? Can we arouse increased thoughtfulness about underlying assumptions as proposals are made for modifying the curriculum to better achieve the goals of citizenship education, so that the result will not be too iconoclastic, rationalistic, and critical, nor overly obeisant to our reactionary predisposition to value and keep whatever has been?

Timetable Describing Social Studies Program for Students Engaged in Two-Year Experimental Curriculum, Grade 7

Topic	*Project Activities*	*Non-Project Activities*
Europe Discovers and Explores the New World to the West		3[a]
European Nations Develop Colonies in the New World		3
Pretest Achievement Battery	2[b]	
Critical Thinking Skills with Short Illustrative Cases	8	
Birth of the American Republic	1	1
An Introduction to the Structure and Principles of American Government	5	
Application of Model for Handling Political Controversy Using Analytic and Political Concepts	3	
Establishment of the New Nation		3
Economic Changes in the New Nation and the Rise of Sectionalism		3
First Posttest Achievement Battery	1[b]	
Total weeks, Grade 7	17	13

[a] Numbers indicate weeks.

[b] Not included in total.

Timetable Describing Social Studies Program for Students Engaged in Two-Year Experimental Curriculum, Grade 8

Topic	*Project Activities*	*Non-Project Activities*
Second Posttest Achievement Battery	2[a]	
American Civil War and Reconstruction		3
School Desegregation	6	
Settling the West		1
The American Indian	1	
Introduction to the Industrialization of America		1
The Problem of Fair Competition and Monopoly	4	
Vocational Guidance		1
American Immigration Policy	1	
Problems of American Labor	4	
Personality Test Battery	2[a]	
United States History: 1900-1925		2
The New Deal	3	
United States History: 1940-1960		2
Review	1	
Third Post-Test Achievement Battery	2[a]	
Total weeks, Grade 8	20	10
Total weeks, Grades 7 and 8	37	23

[a] Not included in total.